

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS


Claims 1 through 7 are pending in this application.

The Office Action objects to the drawings asserting that they fail to show the compression coil spring of claims 6 and 7. Figure 3 has been amended to include this feature of claims 6 and 7. Support for this drawing correction is found in claims 6 and 7, as well as the amended paragraph at page 9, lines 4-8 of the specification.

The Office Action objects to the form of the Abstract due to its length. The abstract has been amended accordingly and a clean Abstract is attached hereto.


The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the admitted prior art of figures 1 and 2. Claim 1 includes the features of a cap comprising an elastic locking member integrally formed therein and elastically biased toward the locking direction, with the elastic locking member having a hook protruded from the inside of the holder through the locking hole into the second connection part and inserted in the fixing hole of the extension pipe through the locking hole to thereby lock the extension pipe. Claim 1 also includes an unlocking lever comprising an operation end being connected with a free end of the elastic locking member and separating the hook from the fixing hole of the extension pipe. In contrast, the prior art of Figure 2 merely has a locking/unlocking member 50 with a hook connected to the member:

FIG. 2
(PRIOR ART)



Thus, the prior art of Figure 2 does not show the features of claim 1 recited above. Claims 5-7 depend from claim 1 and are also not anticipated by Figure 2.

The Office Action rejects claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over the admitted prior art of figures 1 and 2 in view of UK Publication 2,324,712 to Lee. As described above, claim 1 includes the features of a cap comprising an elastic locking member integrally formed therein and elastically biased toward the locking direction, with the elastic locking member having a hook protruded from the inside of the holder through the locking hole into the second connection part and inserted in the fixing hole of the extension pipe through the locking hole to thereby lock the extension pipe. Claim 1 also includes an unlocking lever comprising an operation end being connected with a free end of the elastic locking member and separating the hook from the fixing hole of the extension pipe. The Lee device merely shows a locking member with a hook connected to the member:




Thus, the prior art of Figure 2 in view of Lee does not show the features of claim 1 recited above. Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and are also not anticipated by this combination of art.

Additionally, claim 4 includes the features of a third bracket integrally formed on the cap

to support the axis and a fourth bracket integrally formed on the holder to support the axis. In contrast, Lee uses a single bracket on the holder to provide for rotation of the hook out of the locking hole. Moreover, there is no motivation to modify the Lee device with another bracket extending from the cap because Lee is merely overcoming the bias of coil spring 47 rather than overcoming the bias of an elastic locking member having a hook protruded from the inside of the holder through the locking hole into the second connection part and inserted in the fixing hole of the extension pipe through the locking hole to thereby lock the extension pipe with the unlocking lever comprising an operation end being connected with a free end of the elastic locking member and separating the hook from the fixing hole of the extension pipe as recited in claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that all claims present in this application patentably distinguish over the cited prior art. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections of the claims. Also, applicant respectfully requests that this application be passed to allowance.

Dated: 5/15/06



Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicant
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero
& Perle, LLP
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
telephone (203) 327-4500
fax (203) 327-6401

Amendment to the Drawings

Figure 3 has been amended to include the elastic member described in claims 6 and 7.